

Appl. No. 09/173,040
Amdt. dated 09/30/2005
Reply to Office Action of 07/01/2005

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3 - 6, 8 - 11 and 13 - 27 are pending in the present Application. In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner withdrew the previous rejection to Claims 1, 3 - 6, 8 - 11 and 13 - 27. However, the Examiner objected to Claims 3, 5, 8, 10, 13, 15, 18, 24 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §112 first and second paragraphs as failing to comply with the enablement requirement and for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, respectively. Claims 1, 3 - 6, 8 - 11 and 13 - 27 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Cragun et al. Claims 1, 4, 6, 9, 11, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25 and 26 were further rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Nielsen.

Regarding the objection to Claims 3, 5, 8, 10, 13, 15, 18, 24 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §112 first paragraph, Applicants submit that the Application is amply enabled. Fig. 6 and the text on page 6, line 5 to page 7, line 10 (the text explaining Fig. 6), provide all the disclosure that would enable one skilled in the art to practice the invention.

Notwithstanding the enablement of the invention on page 6, line 5 to page 7, line 10 and Fig. 6, Applicants provide a DECLARATION under 37 C.F.R. §1.132 of a person skilled in the art, an engineer, attesting that the invention can be made or reproduced from the disclosure in the SPECIFICATION. Please find attached the DECLARATION.

In view of the declaration as well as the enablement of the invention on page 6, line 5 to page 7, line 10 and

AT9-98-132

Page 9 of 13

Appl. No. 09/173,040

Amtd. dated 09/30/2005

Reply to Office Action of 07/01/2005

Fig. 6, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

Regarding the objection to Claims 3, 5, 8, 10, 13, 15, 18, 24 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph, the Examiner stated that it seems contradictory that a user would stop or pause the downloading/displaying of an unwanted image to resume its downloading/displaying at a later time. Applicants would like to point out that users may at times change their minds. For instance, a user may at first decide to halt the display/download of a figure and after reading the displayed text decide to view the image after all. In this case, all the user needs to do is to resume image display/download. Hence, Applicants submit that the claims are not indefinite and respectfully request the withdrawal of this objection.

For the reasons stated more fully below, Applicants submit that the claims in the Application are allowable over the applied references. Hence, reconsideration, allowance and passage to issue are respectfully requested.

The present invention provides a mechanism to either suspend the download and display of graphic images in a document. In accordance with the teachings of the invention when a text file containing an embedded image file is to be displayed, the display of the image file may be stopped (while the image file is being displayed) if it is of no interest to the user.

The capability of displaying only image files of interest to the user greatly reduces the time the user spends waiting for a Web page to be displayed.

AT9-98-132

Page 10 of 13

Appl No. 09/173,040

Amdt. dated 09/30/2005

Reply to Office Action of 07/01/2005

The invention is set forth in claims of varying scopes of which Claim 1, reproduced immediately below, is illustrative.

1. A method of controlling web browser document displays, said document being displayed on a display system by a user and having at least a text file and an image file, said method comprising the steps of:

displaying said text file on said display system;

displaying said image file on said display system; and

independently halting the display of said image file, while said image file is being displayed, if said image file is not of interest to the user. (Emphasis added.)

The Examiner rejected the claims as being anticipated by Cragun et al. Applicants respectfully disagree.

As stated in previous actions, Cragun et al. purport to teach an apparatus and method for manually and selectively block image displays. According to the teachings of Cragun et al., when a Web page that includes images is displayed, a user may select one or more images to block from being displayed in the future. If the user does so, when the page is re-accessed in the future, the blocked image or images will not be displayed.

Thus, Cragun et al. do not teach, show or so much as suggest ***independently halting the display of an image, while the image is being displayed*** as claimed since once blocked the image will not be displayed.

In the RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS Section, the Examiner stated that Cragun et al "teach the selective/independent halting of an image, while the computer is displaying it on

AT9-98-132

Appl No. 09/173,040

Amdt. dated 09/30/2005

Reply to Office Action of 07/01/2005

the computer screen." (See paragraph 13 on page 9 of the Office Action of July 01, 2005.) However, it should be noted that what the computer is displaying is the Web page within which the image is embedded. The image itself is never displayed (i.e., the image never begins to be displayed). Indeed the image will never be displayed so long as it remains blocked. Thus, Cragun et al. cannot have taught the step of **independently halting the display of an image, while the image is being displayed** as stated by the Examiner.

The Examiner also rejected the claims as being anticipated by Nielsen. Applicants, again, respectfully disagree.

Nielsen purports to teach a method and apparatus for detecting and presenting client side image map attributes including sound attributes using page layout data strings. According to the teachings of Nielsen, an information display system for enhancing human-computer interactions is disclosed. The system includes an image map detection mechanism for detecting an image map associated with an image. The image map detection mechanism has an audio attribute associated with a selectable area of the image. The system also includes a pre-selection condition detection mechanism that is configured to detect a pre-selection condition on the selectable area in the image. Additionally, the system includes a sound presentation mechanism configured to present a sound through a sound production facility upon detection of the pre-selection condition. The sound is associated with the audio attribute of the selectable area.

AT9-98-132

Page 12 of 13

Appl. No. 09/173,040

Amdt. dated 09/30/2005

Reply to Office Action of 07/01/2005

In providing a background to the disclosure, Nielsen explains that sometimes images cannot be displayed in a browser. When an image cannot be displayed in a browser, an ALT attribute (i.e., text that describes the area in which the image is contained or is to be displayed) is displayed instead of the image. Nielsen further explains that an image may not be displayed, inter alia, because a user has activated the browser's stop download SCA (selectable control area).

But, note that Nielsen does not indicate whether the browser's stop download SCA is activated while the image is being displayed or before the image is displayed. All that is disclosed is that the ALT attribute is displayed instead of the image when the browser's stop download SCA is activated.

Applicants submit, therefore, that Nielsen does not teach, show or suggest the step of **independently halting the display of an image, while the image is being displayed** as claimed.

All the claims in the Application contain, in one form or another, the above-identified element of Claim 1. Applicants, therefore, submit that the pending claims are allowable over the cited references. Thus, reconsideration, allowance and passage to issue are once more respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

By: 

Volel Emile
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 39,969
(512) 306-7869

AT9-98-132

Page 13 of 13